



COLLOQUES &
CONFÉRENCES

The past for the future? What history textbooks does Europe need in the XXI century?

15-16 septembre 2022

Centre Scientifique de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences à Paris

Igor Kałolewski

Centre for Historical Research of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Berlin

Polish-German and Franco-German rapprochement and a role of teaching history in the reconciliation processes after World War 2

In the “Age of Extremes”, as the 20th c. was called by Eric Hobsbawm, international textbook dialogue has been an important element of the long lasting reconciliation processes between nations and countries divided by war atrocities and post-war traumas. In this context, the Franco-German Histoire/Geschichte and the German-Polish Europa – Unsere Geschichte / Europa. Nasza historia transnational history textbook series published at the beginning of the 21st c. might be considered not only as an important stage of bilateral textbook dialogue, but also as crucial points of European reconciliation processes after World War 2.

In my paper, I would like to address two key questions: What place does the textbook dialogue take in the Franco-German and Polish-German models of reconciliation? To what extent do the contents of the Franco-German and Polish-German history textbooks reflect different experiences of France and Poland in the policy of reconciliation with Germany?

The main challenge for an international reconciliation process, understood as intercultural dialogue, is to overcome an asymmetry of experiences from the traumatic past, which has become an essential part of a collective and multigenerational memory of two once hostile sides. Here on the slide only two basic statistics, presenting: a) population losses during World War 2 classified by national criteria or individual

states and b) the forced mass migrations of German population (the so-called *Flucht und Vertreibung*, i.e. Flight and Expulsion) and Polish people (the so-called repatriates) caused by the westward shift of Poland's borders, as a result of the annexation of the former German eastern territories to Poland and the incorporation of the former Polish eastern territories into the Soviet Union in 1945. Both statistics have a symbolic potential for the competition of victims. Depending on the method of calculation, the body count or the number of the resettled people may look different – which can be also variously instrumentalized for current needs of official politics of memory.

These asymmetrical wartime experiences in different countries should also be seen in the context of different foreign policy strategies, as well as public debates about how to deal with the history of World War 2. They have also contributed to different models of reconciliation between the once hostile peoples. However, new positive experiences and contacts between later generations of once hostile communities can reduce such asymmetries through learning processes.

The place of the history textbook dialogue in a reconciliation communication code between France-Germany and Poland-Germany – selected aspects

The main difference between Franco-German and Polish-German reconciliation processes were caused by the geopolitical post-war constellation: the divide of the world by the Iron Curtain and a role of the Franco-German rapprochement as an “engine” of the European integration since the early 1950s. Thus, unlike the Franco-German reconciliation process, which was initiated and carried out primarily by state actors, the driving forces in the first phase of German-Polish reconciliation were the Christian churches and the circles of Catholic intellectuals, including political dissidents, in the Polish People's Republic. Similar groups originally initiated the reconciliation dialogue with Poland in the GDR in the 1960s. Soon, circles of Protestant

intellectual groups in West Germany critical of the Nazi past also became involved.

Franco-German and German-Polish reconciliation gained momentum at the official level after the normalization of bilateral relations, however, in different historical and political contexts. The Franco-German normalization process lasted until the signing of the Elysée Treaty (1963) and, in the German-Polish case, until the signing of the Warsaw Treaty (1970), although the full normalization of German-Polish relations did not occur until the disintegration of the Eastern Bloc and the reunification of Germany as a result of which the German-Polish Border Treaty in 1990 and Treaty of Good Neighborhood in 1991 were signed. In this context, the westward shift of the Polish borders and its recognition by the German government, as well as coming to terms with the related issue of the Flight and Expulsion on the Polish side, were the greatest challenges in the politics of bilateral rapprochement.

In both reconciliation dialogues, symbolic gestures of top politicians, which can be understood as an expression of their transnational, individual but also collective empathy, played an important role, such as Brandt's kneeling in front of the Monument of Warsaw Ghetto Heroes in 1970, Mitterrand's and Kohl's gesture of holding hands in Verdun in 1984 and later Kohl's and Mazowiecki's embrace gesture during the so-called "Reconciliation Church Service" in Krzyżowa (Germ. Kreisau) in 1989. They were emotionally signs of the emerging intercultural code of reconciliation dialogue at the level of the simple code of intercultural communication (nonverbal communication), while the content was shaped differently in Germany, France and Poland by references to concrete historical events as part of the developed code of intercultural communication (including complex vocabulary and sentence structure) in the context of a discourse on the responsibility of the perpetrators and the traumas of the victims of World War 2.

Thus, other important historical references in the postwar history of Franco-German and German-Polish reconciliation policies were also different in many respects. The former referred, among other

things, to the First World War (Kohl-Mitterrand meeting in Verdun in 1984), while the latter predominantly referred to World War 2. At the same time, the thematic references to a more distant past (mostly to Charlemagne/Karl der Grosse, see e.g. Charlemagne Prize), became useful for the formation of a founding myth of European integration through the Franco-German rapprochement than it ever had been the case in the German-Polish reconciliation discourse. One can assume that this European “integration mythology”, invented in the 1950s, had effectively contributed to overcoming the older, post-1870 stereotypes of “Franco-German hereditary enmity” (*rivalité franco-allemande*), while in the Polish-German context the notion of “1000 years of Polish-German enmity” still remained an important component of official communist politics of memory in the postwar period, which was to legitimize the new Oder-Neisse border established in 1945 (with reference to the status quo around the year 1000).

Already since the 1980s, debates about collaboration and complicity in the Holocaust entered the public sphere in France. In Poland, discussions began only after 2000, when the murder of Polish Jews by their non-Jewish neighbors in Jedwabne in July 1941 became a controversial topic of public discourse. In this context, one must attribute great importance in both intercultural discourses of reconciliation to the positioning on the Holocaust and the history of German-French-Polish-Jewish relations during World War 2, as well as to the reconciliation dialogue of these three countries in the postwar period with Israelis and the Jewish diaspora in the United States. In both bilateral reconciliation processes the question of positioning vis-à-vis the “third actor” has become of great importance. Moreover, the issue of the USSR’s co-responsibility for the outbreak of war and the Soviet occupation of the eastern Polish territories after September 17, 1939, also came up as an important additional component of the German-Polish reconciliation dialogue since the 1990s. A good example for that is a meeting in Westerplatte (Poland) and speeches of the Polish, German and Russian leaders on the co-responsibility for the outbreak of World War 2 during the 70th anniversary of this event.

Also bilateral history textbook dialogues have been an important part of the Franco-German and Polish-German reconciliation processes. Moreover, I dare say that the textbook dialogue not only inspired but even initiated the first phase of rapprochement between France and Germany as well as Poland and Germany after World War 1 and World War 2. Here on the slide I try to present the milestones of two textbooks dialogues and quote pregnant words of Gotthold Rhode, a German historian and contributor to the Joint Polish German Textbook Commission: “Those who could foresee, back in 1945, that Polish and German historians and geographers descending from the war generation would be bargaining, inflexibly but to-the-point and kindly, all collegially, in the German language, in Warsaw, over the possibility to reify school textbooks and history lessons, would have been regarded as mentally insane”.

Besides, two binational textbook projects, I referred to at the beginning of my talk, might be seen as a pinnacle of the bilateral reconciliation processes between France and Germany as well as Poland and Germany and important instruments of a transnational developed communication code in the context of mutual reconciliation discourse. Thus, it is no coincidence that just at the beginning of the 21st c. the governments of Poland and Germany initiated a project of the joint German-Polish history textbook (2008) modeled on the Franco-German project (which started in 2003). At the same time both textbooks might be seen as instruments of the EU integration process.

Two first transnational history textbooks in the EU – similarities and differences

Franco-German Histoire/Geschichte and Polish-German Europe – Our History differ from other current transnational history textbook projects, which mainly produced auxiliary teaching materials. They are not only a state-approved binational textbooks, but also present the history of bilateral relations within a much broader context of European and world history.

However, the chronological structure of the two textbook series are largely different. The focus of the three-volume *Histoire/Geschichte* is much more on the history of modernity, which is presented in two volumes (2 and 3) that were also published first. The chronological structure of the four-volume series *Europe – Our History* has been divided more proportionally: Volume 1 covers the period from prehistory to the end of the Middle Ages; Volume 2 begins in 1492 and ends in 1815; Volume 3 is devoted to the so-called “long 19th century”; and Volume 4 from 1918 to the present. This structural difference between the two binational textbook series cannot be explained solely by the fact that the curricula for secondary level 1 in Germany and Poland, for which the Polish-German textbook has been designed, require a more systematic presentation of history than is the case of the Franco-German textbook addressed to high school students. Moreover, the authors and editors of the German-Polish textbook series were confronted with the need for a new narrative in which the history of Eastern Europe was to be told on an equal footing with that of Western Europe. If the history of the so-called “short 20th century” as well as contemporary history in German history teaching usually has a more thematically balanced pattern narrative about Western and Eastern European history, the “East” of the continent appears almost only in the emergence of the new states in Eastern Europe after 1917-1918 or in the explanations of the conflict lines in the Cold War era. Otherwise, the dominant master narrative of the pre- and early modern period focuses on the history of the Western European world.

Obviously, this “Westernization” of the European history master narrative in West European countries is also related to the fact that the earlier history of Western Europe (with Charlemagne/Karl der Grosse, or the cultural contribution of the Enlightenment or the French Revolution in 1789) offers more relevant points of reference among others for the current policy of European integration in the second half of the 20th c. In turn, in the case of the German-Polish textbook series, there was the challenge of deconstructing the far-reaching clichés of Polish memory culture, such as “1000 years of Polish-German

enmity”, which many people especially in Poland still like to project into the present. To deconstruct these ahistorical ideas by a new narrative required more space for explanation of the premodern history in the German-Polish textbook series.

The German-Polish textbook devotes a similar amount of space to the history of the Second World War as altogether 6 chapters in volumes 3 and 4 of the German-French textbook *Histoire/Geschichte*. In the 4th volume *Europe – Our History*, five chapters deal with the most important war events and battles of 1939-1945, everyday life under Nazi occupation as well as in the territories occupied by the USSR until June 1941, resistance to Nazi rule in France and Poland, the partisan war in Yugoslavia and in the occupied territories of the Soviet Union, but also the Jewish resistance through the example of the Uprising in the Warsaw Ghetto in 1943, and finally the German resistance groups such as the White Rose, the Kreisau Circle or the assassins of July 20, 1944. Similar topics has been discussed in *Histoire/Geschichte*, though what understandable, more focus was put on the defeat of France in 1940, the Vichy regime (1940-1944), anti-Semitic persecutions in French territories, the French Résistance, and the liberation of France in 1944.

The two textbook series attempt to present similarities and differences of the Nazi occupation in Western and Eastern European countries, whereby in *Europe – Our History* everyday life in some West and East European capitals (i.e. Copenhagen, Paris and Warsaw) and the specific dimension of the “annihilation war” in Eastern Europe is more strongly emphasized. Of course, topics about the Red Army invasion of Poland on September 17, 1939, as well as the specifics of the Soviet occupation of Polish eastern territories until June 1941, also find much more space in *Europe – Our History* than in *Histoire/Geschichte*, although the Franco-German series also discusses e.g. the Hitler-Stalin Pact and its main consequences.

In both textbooks history of borderlands plays an important role. Border areas have always been interesting laboratories of multiculturalism, escaping narrow definitions and modern myths of

ethnicity. In the German-Polish textbook, there is even a subchapter in each of four volumes called “The Regions that Divide and Unite,” which refers to the history of Silesia, where German, Czech, and Polish cultures for centuries created a synthesis that defied the narrow modern idea of the nation-state. Thus, in Volume 4, authors could better explain such phenomena as the so-called Volksliste in Upper Silesia or the conscription into the Wehrmacht of Polish male youth from this and other regions incorporated into the German “Gross Reich”. The history of the border regions is treated in even greater detail in volume 3 *Histoire/Geschichte*, using the example of Alsace-Lorraine as well as the sensitive topic of malgré-nous in Wehrmacht and SS troops.

In both transnational textbooks, the portrayal of the Holocaust is of particular importance. The story of the extermination of the European Jews was presented in *Histoire/Geschichte* and *Europa – Unsere Geschichte* primarily as “a human experience in the extreme” (Viktor Frankl), offering universal truths about human condition. In the German-Polish textbook, aimed at a younger group of students, relatively extensive fragments from primary sources written by or about children, or iconographic sources showing Jewish children in the ghettos, have been introduced to make the narrative more meaningful to young students. In addition to the positive phenomena, such as the rescue of persecuted Jews, the complicity or indifference of non-Jewish population to the Holocaust is addressed here rather concretely, though the pogroms organized by non-Jewish Poles against their Jewish neighbors in small Polish towns in the summer of 1940, such as Jedwabne, are mentioned only briefly.

In contrast, the topics of complicity of the non-Jewish groups in France in the Holocaust are treated much more broadly and deeply in *Histoire/Geschichte*. This is not only related to the more demanding requirements of the secondary school curriculum or to the extent of French collaboration under the Vichy regime. It seems that the relatively scarce presentation of this delicate subject area in Volume 4 of *Europa – Our History* is due to the highly emotional and socially polarizing disputes in the public contemporary discourse in Poland. At the same

time, the issues about coming to terms with the complex wartime past, including the Holocaust, in post-war France are presented much more extensively and from multiple perspectives in Volume 3 of *Histoire/ Geschichte*.

The Franco-German textbook also deals with the developments of the culture of memory in the Federal Republic of Germany the post-war period up to the present in a profound and critical way. The conclusion here is: “Thus, since the 1990s, the fate of the German war victims – civilians and soldiers – and no longer the reappraisal of the genocide has been the focus of fierce controversy. But can Germany commemorate its victims today without being accused, as in the past, of trivializing the Holocaust and relativizing its responsibility to history?”

Obviously, the curricula for secondary level 1 as well as the principle of didactic reduction did not leave much room for the authors of the German-Polish textbook to present in more detail the complex topic of *Flucht und Vertreibung*, which had been one of the most controversial items on the Polish-German Textbook Commission agenda since the 1970s. It is noticeable that instead of the term *Flucht und Vertreibung*, the term “forced resettlements” is usually used here, also in connection with the forced resettlements of the Polish population from the former eastern Polish territories annexed by the Soviet Union in 1945. Besides, neither the German nor the Polish version explains the German concept of Flight and Expulsion in more detail.

The multi-perspective approach as well as the detailed contents concerning the culture of memory especially in volume 3 of *Histoire/ Geschichte* have to be rated highly. The multi-perspective approach is also a key element of the didactic structure of *Europa – Our History*. Each bigger chapter includes here the section “Points of View” in which the opinions of historians, publicists or acknowledged intellectuals are quoted, and thus the different interpretations of the same historical phenomena become impressively visible. In the chapters on World War 2 the section “Points of View” refers e.g. to the topics: What ordinary Germans’ knew about the Holocaust, or “How is the resistance remembered in Poland and Germany?” and “Who was responsible for

the outbreak of the war?”, where in the last case, the responsibility of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union is discussed – on the one hand, from the perspective typical of Polish contemporary discourse, which emphasizes Stalin’s co-responsibility, and on the other hand, from the point of view of the German master narrative, which mainly blames Nazi Germany for it.

Thus, the multi-perspective approach is meant to convey to the students that the main goal of teaching history is not only to describe “how it really happened”, but to prove that history is always an interpretation of the past (often linked to the present day) and consists of different narratives. This seems to be probably the most important message for any project of a transnational history textbook.

Yuri Shapoval

National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine

How to teach the history of Ukraine in EU countries today?¹

I shall begin with a memory. I was among a group of Ukrainian scholars visiting the Georg-Eckert-Institut für internationale Schulbuchforschung (now Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsmedien | Georg-Eckert-Institut) in Braunschweig for the first time in the 1990s. Compared to the number of textbooks from other countries at that time, the collection of textbooks from Ukraine in this unique library was very poor. We wanted to find the reasons for this negligence. A year later, the part of the library covering Ukrainian textbooks was significantly supplemented, however, with that, many new questions arose. This time, they mainly concerned the content of textbooks published in Ukraine. Here are the most important ones:

- To what extent has the content of history textbooks been influenced by changes during the transition period in Ukraine?
- To what extent does this content reflect the latest historical and social science research in the world in the context of reinterpretation of the past?
- How should Ukrainian textbooks be assessed against the background of the post-Soviet extent with its worldview ambivalence?
- Do Ukrainian history textbooks serve to nurture students' independent thinking and reject any (communist or nationalist) indoctrination?
- How to assess the didactic level of Ukrainian textbooks by comparing them with textbooks in Germany and other countries?

To find answers to these questions, with the support of the Volkswagen Foundation, the Georg Eckert Institute initiated a project on history and social science textbooks in the post-Soviet space.

¹ Translation from Polish to English by Szymon Trzybiński.

In December 1998, in Kyiv, we organised what I believe was the first German-Ukrainian conference on textbooks. The conference was entitled: “Individual and society as problems in the late modern period and contemporary history. Controversial issues in the textbooks for history and social studies”. Participants included scholars from Germany, Ukraine, the Netherlands, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Georgia and Switzerland. Based on the results of the conference, we published a collection of articles entitled “Ukrainian historical didactics” in 2000. Its editors were Magda Telus, an employee of the Georg Eckert Institute, and myself. We analysed and clarified many important issues. We had the illusion that Ukraine had become more comprehensible to Europeans, at least in the field of textbook research.

Today I am speaking on a panel entitled “Forgotten Central Europe? How should Ukrainian and European history be taught in EU countries and Ukraine in today’s day and age?”. My primary wish regarding European textbooks is the following: it is important that Ukrainian history is presented there. A German researcher assessed the current situation in this way: “The place of Ukraine as an independent state and nation has not been and still is not firmly established in the consciousness [of the public opinion] [...] Ukraine has always been regarded as a part, province or backyard of Russia [...] Ukraine had to consolidate its place as an independent member of the family of nations as a result of the Maidan Revolution, just as it now has to do in opposition to the Russian aggressor”. The author concludes then: “Now, much to our shame, we are forced to admit that it took the brutal war and Russian aggression against Ukraine for this great European country, a sovereign state and a nation with rich history of 40 million people to return to the ‘mental map’ of Germany”.

I hope that as a result of the current situation, Ukraine will return the ‘mental map’ of not only Germany, but also all of Europe. Meanwhile, the Russian occupiers and collaborators have shown how they intend to put Ukraine back on the ‘mental map’ of Russia. After seizing Crimea and Donbass, they massively destroyed Ukraine’s history textbooks.

In the temporarily occupied territory of the Luhansk Oblast, they prepared methodological recommendations for the beginning of the school year on 1 September 2022. We come across false statements in these recommendations concerning, among other things, the origins of Kievan Rus or the consequences of the baptism of Volodymyr the Great in Kherson.

The Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation has also published lesson plans and recommendations for educators regarding extracurricular activities entitled “Conversations about what is important”. These classes began to take place in Russian schools from 1 September this year. From the 5th grade, students learn about the ‘special military operation’ in Ukraine. The script for one of the classes states: “Among the objectives of the special military operation are the protection of the population of Donbas, which has been subject to abuse and oppression by the Kyiv regime, the disarmament of Ukraine and the prevention of the deployment of NATO military bases on its territory [...] The massive military aid and other support from the West to the Ukrainian authorities are slowing down the special military operation”.

I hoped that no European schoolbook would contain such statements. Unfortunately, this is not the case. In Hungary, a geography textbook published for the 8th grade is full of anti-Ukrainian propaganda and false facts, the consequence of which may be the dissemination of hostile attitude towards Ukraine among schoolchildren. The content of this textbook convinces Hungarian students that there is a civil war in Ukraine, without Russia’s participation. This opinion is accompanied by an illustration in which a bear symbolising Russia and a figure with symbols of the USA and the European Union struggle over Ukraine. At the same time, students are asked: “To whom [should] Ukraine belong to?”

But let us return to Russia’s attempts to influence the narrative in history books. On 1 September 2022 the President of the Council of the Russian Federation Valentina Matviyenko said that history textbooks should be rewritten – in particular the history of World War II and the

contemporary history of the Russian Federation. In fact, the above-mentioned periods in history should also be rewritten in Western European textbooks, though not in the same way as they will be described in the textbooks currently planned for publication in Russia. With regard to World War II, I will only mention the opinion of Edgar Snow, Saturday Evening Post reporter. In January 1945, he published materials collected during his trip to Ukraine. He wrote, among other things, that the Soviet Union's contribution to the Second World War, attributed mainly to Russia, should be recognised as primarily that of Ukraine, whose cities, industry, agriculture and people suffered enormous damage hardly comparable to that of any other European country.

Let us recall that by the end of November 1942, the German invaders had occupied about 2 million square kilometres of the territory of the then Soviet Union with a population of 85 million, including 41.7 million inhabitants of Ukraine. For comparison, the German occupation covered 17% of Russia's territory with a population of 27 million people. Viewed from this perspective, the theses of Putin's historiography that the Russians suffered the most as a result of World War II sound at least surprising. Such claims monopolise both the suffering of the victims of the war and the victory over Nazi Germany. "Re-Sovietized" textbooks, including other publications and contemporary Russian practices of commemoration in symbolic aspect, also serve this purpose. Western European history textbook authors should not ignore this.

Ukrainian researcher Maria Kovalchuk recently analysed how Ukraine is presented in German history textbooks. Kovalchuk points out that what is Soviet is often referred to as simply "Russian" in the textbook narrative. She also states that after the Holocaust, the most attention is paid to forced labourers as well as Ukrainian collaborators and policemen. In this regard, it is appropriate to recall Norman Davies' ironic opinion about the ways of presentation of Ukrainians in the West: when one wants to praise them they are presented as "Russians" or "Soviets", whereas whenever one wants to condemn them for the evil they did, they are called "Ukrainians".

One of Maria Kovalchuk's conclusions is particularly sad: in German textbooks "Ukraine has been and still is to a large extent perceived more as a territory or geographical space between Russia and Europe. Continuity in textbooks is the privilege of empires, while Ukraine is mentioned only occasionally".

The eminent French historian Marc Bloch, one of the founders of the Annales school, once remarked that no historian would ever hear the roar of cannons at Austerlitz and never see Pharaoh Ramesses. Today, we historians hear the roar of Russian cannons and shells in Ukraine. One of the paradoxes of history is also that, as a result of the ongoing war in Ukraine, many Ukrainian schoolchildren have been sent to European countries and given the opportunity to learn about their history.

Forexample, in Poland, 185,000 Ukrainian children were sent to schools. On 1 September 2022, approximately 60,000 children of Ukrainian refugees went to school in the Czech Republic. They can now see monuments of European history and gain a better understanding of Europe's past and present. They can also compare it with the "values" that Putin's "liberators" are trying to impose on Ukraine.

Let us now take a look at Ukrainian history textbooks. Teaching about the history of Europe starts in the 6th grade with an integrated course on world history and Ukrainian history. The course covers the ancient history of various countries and peoples as well as the territories whose successor is modern Ukraine. Textbooks for the 7th grade cover the medieval world of Western Europe as well as European societies and states in the period between 5th to 11th century. Textbooks for the 8th grade present fragments of European history from 16th to 18th century. Textbooks for the 9th grade cover the late 18th to early 20th century. In the 10th grade, texts present the history of Europe and the world until 1945. Finally, in 11th grade, students learn about history from the end of the Second World War to the beginning of the 21st century.

In my opinion, the current Ukrainian school textbooks for teaching world history are not at all bad. They are oriented around textbooks

published in Western Europe, becoming more and more like them. On the other hand, how should textbooks for learning Ukrainian history be assessed? Once, a so-called textbook commission was set up at the Ukrainian Institute of National Remembrance. It was headed by Professor Natalia Yakovenko. The key task of the commission was to eliminate relics of the Soviet way of thinking in the creation of textbooks. The commission also objected to the ethnocentric presentation of Ukrainian history in textbooks.

The commission believed that the formation of a national identity and a sense of pride in the history of one's own nation should not be implemented through the methods of Soviet propaganda. This could do more harm than good. Historical education requires developing a sensitivity to the culture and history of both, one's own and other nations.

School mathematics can easily exist outside of concrete time and space, i.e. without reference to the reality of the here and now. It is different with historical education. The Ministry of Education of Ukraine has repeatedly "revised" the content of textbooks for teaching Ukrainian history. In addition to that, there is a problem that the Ukrainian population is not homogeneous in its views. Therefore, the version of collective identity offered by today's textbooks can hardly be considered successful.

However, Russia's war with Ukraine, which began in 2014, and especially the new phase of aggression after 24 February 2022, has changed this situation. Although the need to change the outdated narratives of the 19th and early 20th century in the creation of Ukrainian history textbooks is still valid, the situation with the presentation of European and world history in Ukrainian school textbooks – as I mentioned above – is better. In this regard, Ukrainian textbooks teach learning about the world "through history". They teach the understanding that the modern world is built on the foundations of democracy. And an effective democracy needs citizens who consciously choose their own position and no less consciously recognise the right of those who think differently to do the same.

Heraclitus once remarked that “war is the mother of things”. Today’s Russian aggression against Ukraine, this new traumatic epidemic, is not only bringing destruction. War is changing the world. The war has become an important factor in the consolidation of Ukrainians, a factor in the further formation of a political nation and civil society in modern Ukraine. It is difficult to predict when exactly the process of their formation will finally end. However, we can safely assume that they will be formed eventually.

It is important for the authors of history textbooks to follow this process, both in Ukraine and in the West.

Le passé pour l'avenir ? De quels manuels d'histoire l'Europe a-t-elle besoin au XXI^e siècle ?

Aus der Vergangenheit für die Zukunft lernen?
Welches Geschichtsbuch braucht Europa im 21. Jahrhundert?

Przeszłość dla przeszłości?
Jakiego podręcznika do nauki historii potrzebuje Europa
na początku XXI wieku?

15-16/09/2022

*European Forum for Reconciliation and Cooperation
in History and Social Sciences Education*



Affiche

 PROGRAMME

JEUDI 15 SEPTEMBRE 9.00 – 19.30

- 9.00–9.30 **Ouverture du colloque**
 Dr Magdalena Sajdak, Directrice du Centre Scientifique de l'Académie Polonaise des Sciences à Paris
 Véronique Roger-Lacan, S.E. Déléguée Permanente de la France auprès de l'UNESCO
 Dr Peter Reuss, S.E. Délégué Permanent de l'Allemagne auprès de l'UNESCO
 Marta Szlifirska, Déléguée Permanente Adjointe de la Pologne auprès de l'UNESCO
- 9.30–10.00 **Conférence d'ouverture: *Projets transnationaux de manuels scolaires d'histoire***
 Prof. Eckhardt Fuchs (Braunschweig)
- 10.00–12.00 **Panel: Forum européen pour la réconciliation et la coopération dans l'enseignement de l'histoire et des sciences sociales: objectifs, résultats intermédiaires, perspectives**
 Modération: Prof. Eckhardt Fuchs (Braunschweig)
 Participants: PD Steffen Sammler, Dr Marcin Wiatr, Patrycja Czerwińska (Braunschweig)
- 12.00–13.00 Déjeuner
- 13.00–15.00 **Table ronde: *Comparaison d'expériences du travail sur les manuels scolaires franco-allemands et germano-polonais: «Histoire / Geschichte» et «Europa – Unsere Geschichte / Europa. Nasza historia»***
 Modération: Prof. Igor Kąkolewski (Berlin)
 Participants: Prof. Ulrich Pfeil (Metz), Prof. Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg (Gießen), Prof. Violetta Julkowska (Poznań)

- 15.00–15.30 Pause-café
- 15.30–17.30 **Panel: A la recherche d'une «troisième Europe» ?
L'histoire de l'Europe centrale et orientale dans les
stratégies narratives des manuels scolaires: «Histoire /
Geschichte» et «Europa – Unsere Geschichte / Europa.
Nasza historia»**
Modération: Prof. Ulrich Pfeil (Metz)
Participants: Prof. em. Etienne François (Berlin),
Prof. Igor Kąkolewski (Berlin), Prof. Corine Defrance
(Paris), Dr Dominik Pick (Berlin), Wiesława
Araszkiewicz (Szamotuły)
- 17.30–18.00 Pause-café
- 18.00–19.30 **Table ronde des enseignants: *Approches bi-
et transnationales dans l'enseignement de l'histoire
en Allemagne, en France et en Pologne. Échange
d'expériences issues de la pratique scolaire***
Modération: Dr Marcin Wiatr (Braunschweig)
et Dr Dominik Pick (Berlin)
Participants: Barbara Serrier (Berlin), Margit Sachse
(Darmstadt), Anita Kopczyńska (Varsovie), Joanna Pick
(Berlin), Daniel Freudenreich (Francfort-sur-l'Oder)

VENDREDI 16 SEPTEMBRE 9.00 – 17.30

- 9.00–11.15 **Table ronde: *Entre conflit et rapprochement.
Nouveaux projets transnationaux pour l'enseignement
de l'histoire et les initiatives de paix : Pologne-
Ukraine-Russie***
Modération: Dr Ewa Tartakowsky (Paris)
Participants: Dr Oksana Zorych (Kyiv/Paris),
Agnieszka Jaczyńska (Zamość), Dr Emmanuelle Hébert
(Louvain-la-Neuve), Lena Radauer (Lunebourg)

- 11.30–13.00 **Panel: *Entre conflit et rapprochement. Projets transnationaux pour l'enseignement de l'histoire : Moldavie, Balkans, Turquie, Israël-Palestine***
 Modération: Dr Ewa Tartakowsky (Paris)
 Participants: Aurélie Stern (EHESS Paris et Istanbul), Prof. Dubravka Stojanović (Belgrade), Prof. Sergiu Musteata (Chisinau), Dr Achim Rohde (Berlin)
- 13.00–14.00 Déjeuner
- 14.00–15.30 **Table ronde: *Entre conflit et rapprochement. Les expériences de la Commission bilatérale polono-ukrainienne pour les manuels scolaires, de la Commission germano-ukrainienne des historiens et de la Commission germano-russe des historiens***
Modération: Dr Emmanuelle Hébert (Louvain-la-Neuve)
 Participants: Prof. Karol Sanojca (Wrocław), Prof. Miloš Rezník (Varsovie), Prof. Olena Malynovska (Kyiv/Braunschweig)
- 15.30–16.00 Pause-café
- 16.00–17.30 **Discussion: *Le centre oublié de l'Europe? Comment enseigner aujourd'hui l'histoire ukrainienne dans les pays de l'UE et l'histoire européenne en Ukraine?***
 Modération: PD Steffen Sammler (Braunschweig)
 Participants: Prof. Thomas Serrier (Lille), Prof. Jurij Shapoval (Kyiv/Braunschweig), Prof. Karol Sanojca (Wrocław),
 Dr Katarzyna Moskiewicz (Poznań)